

Christianity and Crisis

PUBLIC LIBRARY
MAR 1 1948
DETROIT

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. VIII, No. 4

MARCH 15, 1948

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

A Democratic Strategy Toward the Communists

COMMUNIST groups have been active in the United States since shortly after the Russian Revolution of 1917. There has been a long debate as to the proper method of treating them in a democracy. This question has come to be of central importance recently, largely because tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union have increased greatly during the last two years. The Communists and their "front organizations" have resisted all American policies which seem to them opposed to the interests of the Soviet Union, including efforts to modify or bypass the veto power in the Security Council of the United Nations, the Truman Doctrine, and currently the Marshall Plan.

The Communists argue that their opposition to such American policies is dictated by their desire for peace rather than by a superior loyalty to Soviet Russia. Technically, the Communist party in the U.S.A., as it has called itself since 1929, claims to be a purely independent American organization, and denies all charges of control or support from Moscow. It is true that the party officially broke its connection with the Communist International in 1940, and it has not thus far joined the recently organized Cominform. But the American Communists have persisted in shifting their line to conform to changes in Russian foreign policy, and there is no reasonable basis for doubt that they will continue to do so. In the deplorable event that war developed between the United States and Russia, many of them would probably desert the Communist party, just as many have deserted it in times past—for example, in the period from 1939-1941—when the die was cast inexorably between American and Russian interests. Those who remained in the party would undoubtedly try to serve as Russian agents, and would do whatever they could to cripple the United States.

In any event, the harm done to the United States by the Communists is probably as great now, in peacetime, as it would be in time of war, and the current wave of concern about them is not based solely on the possibility of armed conflict with Russia. They may or may not be conspiring to "overthrow the government by force and violence." Whatever their intent and their methods, they do not appear to comprise a real threat to the defenders of the *status quo* in the United States. Rather, the

Communists are a greater threat to those movements which are devoted to improving democracy, looking toward a more just America, than they are to those which seek merely to preserve the *status quo*. Their real damage is done to the liberal movements in America, especially to the trade unions, where they have succeeded in stirring up a great deal of turmoil and confusion.

The Communists are not as strong in the liberal movements and in the trade unions of the United States as the public is led to believe. There are probably less than 75,000 members of the Communist party in this country, and probably less than half of them are members of unions. Communists therefore comprise an infinitesimally small percentage of the fifteen million members of American unions. They have succeeded in getting elected to important offices in about a half dozen of the significant unions, and they have exercised influence out of all proportion to their numerical strength. In the last few months there have been strong revolts against them in several of the liberal organizations and unions where they had exercised most control, and the Communists are progressively being exposed, isolated, and removed from positions of leadership.

A democratic strategy for dealing with the Communists would include at least the following elements:

1. The principle of the President's loyalty test for government employees is a sound one. A government clearly has a right to expect loyalty and integrity of its employees, and to protect itself against sabotage and espionage, especially in its more "sensitive" and strategic agencies. As to whether the application of the loyalty test will degenerate into an inquisition depends largely on the way in which it is administered. Only a very careful and discriminating administration of the President's order can prevent innocent employees from being falsely accused and discharged, with fundamental democratic rights being abrogated in the process. The meaning of "loyalty" should be defined more precisely, and the basic safeguards suggested by the President's Committee on Civil Rights should be incorporated into the procedure. The loyalty review procedure may easily result in a denial of basic civil rights; if so, it should be either revised or abolished.

The United States must not become a police state in the effort to keep the Communists from turning us into one.

The extent of disloyalty among government employees has probably been exaggerated. Of the first 420,000 employees investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 400 required further investigation; 66 have been exonerated; 25 resigned before investigation and disloyalty has been proved on only 8 cases.

2. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has clearly failed to respect either democratic rights or democratic procedures, and it should be abolished. Its high-handed procedures and undiscriminating charges have really helped the Communists, in that they have created a profound mistrust of all effort to expose Communist activities, and have also enabled the Communists whom it has exposed to pose as martyrs.

3. Various bills before the present Congress propose to outlaw the Communist party. It is difficult to reconcile with democratic principles and with basic civil liberties a proposal to make any particular form of political belief illegal in this country. To be sure, there is nothing in the democratic creed that prompts us to grant civil liberty at the serious risk of the very institutions of liberty. But the Communist threat to democracy is hardly that serious. The Supreme Court has ruled that "a clear and present danger" must exist before suppression of free speech is warranted. The Communists are dangerous, but they are less dangerous than the fundamental abridgment of civil liberties would be.

The fact that the Communists themselves do not really believe in civil liberties, except for themselves, should not betray us into accepting their kind of logic. We tolerate Communists in a democracy in spite of what they believe, and because of what democracy believes about civil liberties.

Further, outlawry of the Communist party would simply drive its members further underground, and thereby make it even harder to watch them. Efforts to repress radical groups by making them illegal have seldom succeeded; a number of nations which followed this tactic after the first World War are now in Communist hands.

4. Communists ought to be prosecuted, as ought any residents of this country, when they break the law or openly defy the government. It ought not to be a crime to be a Communist, but no special immunity is due to Communists who break the law. In the course of their secretive operations, Communists frequently ignore or bypass legal regulations. They are often guilty of passport fraud, perjury, refusal to produce records under subpoena, and refusal to testify under oath. All infractions of the law, whether by Communists or non-Communists, ought to be prosecuted vigorously. As Eric Johnston put it, in America we "prosecute but do not persecute."

5. The best public policy toward the Communists, if it were possible, would be that of ignoring them. They thrive on public attention and persecution. By their undiscriminating campaigns against "the Communist menace," the Hearst and Scripps-Howard newspapers have probably helped the Communists far more than they have hurt them. Nothing helps the real Communists to conceal their identity and operations more effectively than the use of such terms as "Communist" and "Red" to designate all liberals or any person with whom one happens to disagree.

The most effective policy toward the Communists is that of exposing them, accurately and with discrimination, in the organizations which they try to manipulate—that of defending their right to believe as they please but also exercising one's own right to freedom of speech against them. It is impossible to ignore the Communists; it is foolish to hurl blanket charges without evidence. The most effective procedure is that of accurate exposure.

6. More positively, and most important of all, those of us who are plain citizens can be more militant champions of democracy ourselves. Communists could not control any significant organization if the rank and file of their members attended meetings regularly and assumed their responsibilities seriously.

If we would face up to the challenge presented by the Communists, we must work for a society and a world order in which democracy, justice and security have been so firmly established that the Communists cannot capitalize on our shortcomings and on the miseries of the disadvantaged. The Communists do not necessarily call attention to our shortcomings in the effort to remedy them; in many ways, they have become reactionaries in that they are willing to sacrifice all other immediate aims for the purpose of preserving a stake in the *status quo*—the security of Soviet Russia. But the immediate purposes of the Communists thrive on insecurity, unemployment, and hatred; if another depression comes, they will have their golden opportunity in the United States and in the world. The best friends of the Communists in the long run are public apathy and a trend toward political and economic reaction. The world enemy of the Communists is a strong and healthy democracy.

L. P.

Editorial Notes

The successful Communist coup in Czechoslovakia is one of the most alarming and also one of the most tragic events since the end of the war. We have been assured so often by Czechs that this could not happen there, that Czech Communists were really democrats in spirit, that Russia could be trusted to respect Czech institutions provided she was assured of Czech support in foreign policy. These events demonstrate the fallacy of any such confidence con-

cerning Communist intentions. We can only hope that the way in which Czech Communists carry on their dictatorship will be more moderate than has been the case with Communists elsewhere, but there is no assurance that this will be the case.

It should be clear now, if it was not clear before, that the Russian-Communist drive for power, whether or not it is based partly on fear, will take advantage of any soft spot anywhere to extend itself by its own characteristic methods of infiltration, conspiracy and a perpetual war of nerves against all opponents. This pattern depends upon there being a large minority of Communist sympathizers and another large bloc of opinion that has been duped by them. Where these conditions are absent it is still possible to prevent the extension of Communism. Also, it should be remembered that it was easier for Communists to dupe non-Communists in Czechoslovakia than in western European countries because of the Slavic bond between Russians and Czechs, and because of the fact that Russia and Czechoslovakia share resentment against Munich and have in common a special fear of Germany. These considerations, taken together, should make Americans aware of what happens when people are duped by Communists, but they should keep us from being fatalistic about the indefinite extension of Communism to the point of a final military conflict. Henry Wallace and his followers need to learn from the mistake of the Czechs who until a few days ago talked as they do.

There is a very tragic aspect of what has happened in Czechoslovakia. It is at least arguable that Russia and some of the feudal countries in eastern Europe have gained something from Communism. The cost has been great but at least there

has been in return a rough democratization of economic life that has had its good side for much of the population. And even the cost has not been as great as it seems to us because those countries had no democratic institutions to lose. But here is a country that, to a considerable extent, had the best of our Western forms of freedom and which was on the way to a democratic socialism. For Communists to take over such a country is to destroy values that it takes generations to develop and to provide no compensation. Communists, both because of their experience and because of their theory, have no understanding of political freedom and the forms of personal freedom that depend upon political freedom. They are under the illusion that, if they overcome Capitalism and pull up its roots in a society, freedom will automatically develop, and while under this illusion they destroy recklessly the political institutions of freedom without realizing how difficult it is for such institutions to grow again anywhere. When the Nazis destroyed freedom they increased the love of it in their victims, but Czech Communists are working more from the inside and they are successful in spreading great moral confusion concerning the issues that are at stake.

If the new situation in Czechoslovakia means that Czech churchmen are unable to continue their contacts with the Western churches this will be a great blow to the ecumenical movement. Ever since the war at ecumenical conferences it has been the Czechs who have been the only bridge between East and West. It was the Czech voice that could be counted on to offer the kind of criticism that Christians from the West needed even though events have shown that sometimes the criticism was mixed with illusions.

J. C. B.

Peace or War in Palestine

BAYARD DODGE

ALMOST everybody in America is anxious to help the Jews, who have suffered so much during the past decade. We also desire peace. It is, therefore a great shock to follow the events in Palestine. It is becoming increasingly clear that, in order to introduce any large number of immigrants into the Holy Land, it will require a struggle, which may easily be on the scale of our own Civil War.

Not only well meaning Christian leaders, but even the highest executives in Washington, were so convinced that the Arabs would not raise serious objections to Partition, that they did not take seriously the warnings of missionaries, as well as of the experts of the Department of State and the Army Intelligence. Now everybody realizes that the Arabs really do object to the idea of Partition, as it has been recommended by the Assembly of the United Nations.

This objection on the part of the Arabs is likely to lead to a number of results, which Americans as a whole have not been able to foresee.

The attempt to aid the displaced persons in Europe, by sending them to Palestine, will place the Jews in the outlying districts of Palestine itself, as well as the quarter million Jews in the states of the Arab League, in great peril. By trying to help the Jews in Europe, we are likely to subject the Jews in the Near East to persecution and massacre.

The Jews in the Arab lands are aware of this danger. A recent letter from Beirut says that the Jewish merchants there are subscribing 200,000 Lebanese pounds to the Arab National Fund. A friend in the American Consulate General in Jerusalem has told me that the Jews have been coming in large numbers for over a year to ask for visas, to enter the United States. The papers recently published that the representatives of the 125,000 Jews in Iraq informed the Arabs that they would be on their side. The Jewish members of both houses of the Egyptian Parliament announced that they would side with the Arabs, and the Grand Rabbi of the colony of 100,000 Jews in Egypt, went to the

Palace, to assure the King that the Egyptian Jews would side with their fellow countrymen in Egypt, most of whom are Arabs.

If American Christians insist upon sending large numbers of Jewish immigrants to Palestine, it will wreck much of the work, which missionaries have carried on for a century, among the Oriental Christians and Moslems of the Southern Near East.

At the same time that Christians are trying to overcome prejudice in America by upholding Partition, the American Council for Judaism, the President of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem, and numerous rabbis, are opposing the Zionist policy in Palestine. Many fear that it may produce the same sort of Anti-Semitism in America, which it has already caused in England. Perhaps the Jewish moderates are unduly cautious, but they feel that if explosives are shipped from American ports, if the blood of American boys is shed, if American stockholders incur losses, if Russia gains a foothold in the Middle East, and if the Hebrew people place their allegiance to an independent Jewish state ahead of their loyalty to the United States, it will increase Anti-Semitism in America.

The Secretary of Defense has told a Congressional Committee that the reconstruction and defense of Western Europe will depend largely upon making more of the Middle Eastern oil available on the Mediterranean coast. This means building new pipe lines and refineries. The construction of the largest of these pipe lines, which was due to begin in February, has been indefinitely postponed.

People in America supposed that it was an expression of moral idealism, for the United Nations to give the Jews a state of their own. It has, therefore, been upsetting to find that twenty members of the United Nations Assembly so seriously questioned the legality of Partition, that they wished to have the matter studied by the International Court of Justice, before taking final action. Only twenty-one members defeated this project, as many of the members did not feel sure enough about the question to vote.

When Russia and America voted in unison for Partition, there was a general feeling of satisfaction. Now the reasons for Russia's action are being explained by the experts. Russia desires anarchy, so as to tie up the petroleum industry and create an atmosphere favorable for Communist propaganda. Russia has already shown her desire to send immigrants to Palestine from the Black Sea ports and many suspect her motives. Russia is glad to have a precedent which will make it reasonable to split off the Armenian and Kurdish minorities from Turkey, Iran and Iraq, so as to establish them as autonomous soviets. Russia will be relieved to see the American prestige in the Southern Near East collapse and to feel that there may be a chance to send Communist units to Palestine, as part of an International Police Force.

If Russia, or some of her satellite states, do contribute troops to the International Police Force, and if this force is sent to Palestine, the much desired Jewish independence may not be any more satisfac-

tory than the actual freedom of Korea and Austria.

Many believed that, even if the Arabs should make some objections, the Partition would remain a local Palestinian affair, which could be settled in a few months. Now they realize that it may continue indefinitely to be an international issue of major importance, involving the 38,000,000 people of seven Arab states, backed by Iran, Pakistan, and perhaps a number of the other great Asiatic countries.

I think that the reason why people have been so disillusioned by these unexpected events, is because they have not kept abreast of the rapid changes, which have taken place in the Middle East. They have supposed that the Arabs were ignorant nomads and peasants, too primitive to deserve political consideration.

In the states of the Arab League as a whole there are a large number of nomads and peasants, just as there are many Negro sharecroppers, "Poor Whites" and Indians in the United States. But there is also an increasingly important minority of wealthy, cultured people, who live in fine new residential districts, go about in the latest models of American cars, send their sons abroad for study, construct beautiful institutions, and develop modern forms of trade and professional life.

The Arab States have now become independent, with their own legations and representatives at the United Nations. Five of them have their own airplanes. Their combined armies number about 150,000, with considerable mechanization. The northern states have rapidly expanding school systems, good roads, new hospitals, radio stations, experimental farms, and other forms of progress.

Many people have thought that the quickest way to make the Arabs advance would be to bring in large numbers of Jews who could teach them modern methods. In theory the Jews ought to be able to bring great benefits to Palestine and its neighboring states.

The Jews have the most up-to-date hospital, the finest orchestra, the best agricultural laboratories, and the most modern factories in the Near East. Their beautiful farm colonies would do credit to California. Their chemical industries and citrus groves are models for all to admire.

But unfortunately the Arabs are too much afraid of Jewish expansion to be willing to learn from them. It is not boasting, but a statement of fact to say that Arab progress depends much more upon American industry and philanthropy, than it does on Jewish example.

American petroleum investments of over a billion dollars, added to those of the British and French, will provide the funds for most of the Arab states to carry out large scale irrigation projects, as well as to develop agriculture, health and education.

The Rockefeller Foundation and Near East Foundation can teach methods of developing peasant life, from the point of view of public health, and also of modern farming, home economics, child care, recreation, and rural education.

Our Protestant and Catholic missions and our

non-sectarian colleges are developing leaders with the spiritual strength to demand integrity, toleration, and public service. Large numbers of them are in places of great influence in the different government departments, as well as in business and the professions.

The whole Arab world stands at a parting of the ways. On one side a very important minority of educated men and women is striving to follow the path of stability, toleration and progress. At the same time a majority of reactionary people is in danger of going the way of exploitation, violence and fanaticism.

If our American industry and philanthropy can carry on without interruption, I believe that the educated group will win and that the standards of living will be raised so much, that there will be little danger of reaction or social revolution. On the other hand, if the Arabs cut themselves off from the help, which we Americans are able to give them, I fear that there will be a return to low standards, with great danger of Communist penetration. Even though many of the educated chiefs may desire moderation, feeling is running so high, that I believe the Arabs will cripple or even close down our American activities, in case we back up the sending of large numbers of European immigrants to Palestine.

The petroleum companies expect to build five new pipe lines, as well as harbors and refineries. The Trans-Arabian Pipe Line alone will keep 15,000 laborers busy for a number of years, and the new refinery at Sidon will employ between five and ten thousand men permanently. Recent word from Lebanon says that, because pipe line construction has been interrupted, there is growing unemployment, poverty, and opportunity for Communist propaganda.

Let us now turn to the plan for Partition, which is causing so much excitement and giving so much concern to all who desire to see peace and progress in the Middle East.

The Arabs and Jews are to have separate governments, free to conduct foreign affairs, defense, education, land registry, immigration, and other activities, as though they were entirely independent states.

But there is to be an Economic Union, which is to administer many of the affairs of the two groups with close team work. Transportation, car licenses, railroads, telephones and telegraphs, pipe lines, mails, customs, currency, electric power, irrigation, control of diseases—human, animal and plant—supervision of narcotics, prostitution and crime, and last but not least care of pilgrims and tourists, must be managed with the closest kind of cooperation.

This Economic Union is needed, because the Holy Land is not to be divided into two well defined sections. It is rather to be broken up into a checkerboard pattern of zones:—three Jewish, three Arab, and one International, with Jaffa added as an isolated Arab city. A member of each race has the right to decide in which state he wishes to register his citizenship. At the start there will be nearly half a million Arabs in the Jewish zones.

The Arabs have refused to accept this arrangement from the start. I think that they made a mistake when they refused to cooperate with the United Nations Commission, which was sent to Palestine before the Assembly considered the plan. If they had made some constructive proposals at the very start, it might have prevented trouble later on. But it is significant that the Arabs did propose a compromise at the last minute; too late to be given the attention that it deserved.

The proposal was important, because it showed what the Arabs are willing to agree to and what they absolutely refuse to accept. The compromise was that the complex of Partition and Economic Union, voted by the Assembly, should be developed in a logical way, so as to become a federal state, with a canton system, similar to the federation of the French and Germans in Switzerland.

The Zionists opposed this plan, as they realized that the federal government would fix the immigration quotas and prevent the crowding of European immigrants into Palestine. It is this question of immigration which is the crux of the whole dispute.

I have been assured by competent Arab leaders that they are willing to accept some sort of a federal state, provided it can be conducted according to the regularly established principles of democratic government, with respect for human rights. Although they will insist upon limiting immigration, they will respect the rights of the Jewish cantons, so that they can form the sort of spiritual and cultural "National Home" which the non-Zionist Jews have asked for.

The Arabs feel that the development of the evidently unworkable Partition Plan, with its Economic Union, into a federal state, probably under United Nations trusteeship, will not be a step backwards, but rather a step forwards, for the United Nations to take.

Arabs are panic stricken over the prospect of immigration, because they believe that the Zionists wish to bring in so many young men of military age, with so many war supplies, that it will only be a matter of time before the Jews try to seize all of Palestine and lands east of Jordan as well.

Whether it is reasonable for the Arabs to feel this way is not the point. The trouble is they do feel this way, because the Zionists have spoken so freely and repeatedly about their rights to all of Palestine and Trans-Jordan. Thus the Arabs are willing to compromise about almost everything except immigration, while the Zionists stress large scale immigration as the important issue of their program.

On the other hand, the American Council for Judaism, the Jews living in Arab lands, and many independent persons feel that it would be better to have some sort of compromise, rather than to run the risk of bloodshed and of Anti-Semitic reaction.

Thus the American people are confronted by this question: Shall they encourage the United Nations Security Council to send troops to Palestine, so as to force the Arabs to accept unlimited immigration into a state the size of Vermont, although many of the Jews themselves oppose the plan, and although

it is evident that the use of armed forces will result in war?

Would it be better for the Americans to use their influence in the Security Council, to prevent the sending of troops to Palestine? If that alternative is chosen, the Council will probably order a "Cease fire" and try to persuade the moderates on both sides to settle the dispute by arbitration and compromise. If the two parties cannot agree, their fighting will be confined to Palestine, as a local matter, instead of being allowed to become a war of international proportions.

I do not pretend to be wise enough to serve as an oracle for Near Eastern affairs. But for what it is worth, my judgment is that if America encourages the Security Council to implement the Partition plan in its present form by force of arms, it will produce results of far reaching importance. Let me give three examples of the sort of things that I fear.

The United Nations will be unable to retain the Asiatic countries as loyal members. The friendship which exists between the Christians of the West and the quarter billion Moslems of the world will be partly or entirely destroyed. In the course of the next quarter century, the U.S.S.R. will become the dominant power in the Near East.

I should think that it would be better for the Arabs to show as much friendship as possible for the Jews, rather than to become involved in a war which may last for years. I should think that it would be better for the Jews to make sure of "The establishment in Palestine of a national home," to serve as a cultural and spiritual base for World Jewry, rather than to gamble on a war, in hopes of multiplying their population and setting up a sovereign state.

I should think that it would be better for America to solve the problem of displaced persons, by giving them refuge in the United States, rather than to try to force the refugees into Palestine, in a way that may render progress and stability in the Middle East impossible.

I should think that it would be better for the Security Council to base its prestige on its appeals to make peace by arbitration, rather than upon its power to implement by force of arms an issue which twenty of the members of the United Nations have challenged as illegal. A permanent solution can only be found, as during a number of years enough friendship and confidence can be produced, to quiet the Arab fears of Jewish expansion.

I am sure that it is the duty of Christian people to try to produce peace and progress in the Near East, by sending technical experts, doctors, missionaries and teachers, instead of by sending troops. Let us do honor to Mr. Gandhi, by learning a lesson from him. Let us not meet hate with more hate and force with more force.

Let us consistently entreat the extremists on both sides to refrain from violence. Let us encourage the moderates to find some middle ground. The Seers of old prophesied a return to Mt. Zion. But let us leave it to the Divine Providence to carry out his

purposes, without human interference and bloodshed. For one greater than the Prophets has said: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God."

Editor's Note: President Dodge, who has spent a lifetime in the Middle East as President of Beirut University, was asked by the editorial board to give his impressions and convictions of the Palestinian situation. His position accurately reflects the prevailing opinion in the missionary movement of the Middle East.

The complexity of the issues in Palestine is attested by the fact that so many men of good will take completely contradictory views of the situation. President Dodge rightly points out that the Arab and the Jewish state, which would emerge from partition, could not become economically viable if the highest measure of economic cooperation were not achieved, an end which will not be easily attained within the present framework of animosity. On the other hand it must be pointed out that the bi-national state was found unacceptable by the United Nations, primarily because the Arabs were unwilling to grant the Jews any freedom in immigration in such a bi-national state.

It must also be observed that the proposal to resubmit the question to the United Nations is fraught with the gravest perils. Responsible observers, close to the situation, express the fear that such a policy may completely destroy the United Nations because there is little prospect that an agreement could be reached on any alternative proposal, thus making confusion worse confounded.

R. N.

Communication

Dear Sir:

Milan, Italy

I am conscious of the fact that nothing could be added to your perfect "Editorial Note" in *Christianity and Crisis* No. 22, December 22nd, 1947, to the article of Dr. Alec Vidler, but I cannot refrain from expressing my praise and adding the following comment.

While churches are getting nearer to the General Ecumenical Assembly of Amsterdam it becomes more and more evident how difficult it is to reach general agreement as to the action that churches should take in regard to world affairs. But the so-called minority churches which have experienced totalitarian governments and nationalistic craze are, in my opinion, in the best position to give useful indications from their bitter experience. The foremost of all is that national emphasis is the greatest enemy of Christian brotherhood. The churches under totalitarian governments have learned that one cannot share Christian loyalty with any other loyalty on earth. If Amsterdam should only reach this one result that churches cannot be national if they want to remain Christian, Amsterdam would have rendered one of the greatest possible services to mankind, and would remain as an outstanding witness to the Word of God.

This is probably why Christians today are becoming more and more aware of the necessity of separation between state and church.

ERICO ROLLIER.

The World Church: News and Notes

Toyohiko Kagawa
Writes from Tokyo

Dr. Stanley Armstrong Hunter of Berkeley, California, received a letter from Dr. Toyohiko Kagawa written from Tokyo expressing thanks for relief packages. He writes: "During the year I have been able to preach to half a million people throughout Japan. God has so wonderfully sustained me while I traveled 90 sleepless nights on trains and under most terrible traffic conditions. I am still on the job depending upon your continuous prayers that the ever-whelming spiritual hunger and unprecedented opportunities of this time may be met by us Christians who have peace in the midst of all physical sufferings and great perplexities beyond description.

"You may be interested to know that my chief concern at present is to carry on the nation-wide evangelistic campaign even with a greater devotion and enthusiasm for the coming year and I cannot afford to lose a single day when I think I can easily win at least 500 souls average a day if I keep it up in this way. It is so gratifying that a large number out of these 110,000 people who decided to follow Jesus Christ at my meetings are joining different churches after confession of faith and baptism. I believe more than ever only through spiritual revival can we save our country from our present crisis and at this Christmas time again I am reminded of the same spirit of Christ's incarnation with which I entered into the slum work years ago and I shall forever live up to it by the help of God."

The Color Bar in Australia

One of the most disquieting symptoms of the hatreds engendered by war is the appearance of race feeling within Australia. We urge the need of abandoning the White Australian Policy as a needlessly negative and provocative doctrine, and replacing it by a positive policy of controlled immigration similar to that of Canada and New Zealand.

We have also expressed our distress at the threatened deportation of the Malayans who have married Australian wives. Recently, a further sign of the same un-Christian spirit was revealed in the small township of Kinchela, near Kempsey, when the local Parents and Citizens' Association protested against an Education Department move to have aboriginal and white children educated together at the local school. The school inspector, after trying to persuade the parents to adopt a more liberal outlook, was told that the parents believed that aboriginal children mixing with white children would have a bad moral effect upon the latter.

It is worth recording that for some years past aboriginal children from the Anglican mission settlements in Northern Queensland have been educated at All Souls' School and at S. Gabriel's School, Charters Towers. No objection has been brought forward by the parents at these secondary schools. The aboriginal children have distinguished themselves both in work

and in sport, and one of them, after being captain of the school, came on to the University of Queensland.

It will be a tragedy for Australia if young children are encouraged to cherish racial prejudices, instead of growing up in the belief of the "One World" which we fought two great wars to create.

It is worth remembering that the aborigines possessed this land before ourselves, and that Australia is the only part of the British Empire which cost us almost nothing in blood, to settle. It was the greed of our forefathers which was so largely responsible for the annihilation of the aboriginal inhabitants, and it is now the duty of all good Australians, and especially those who venerate Christ, who acknowledge no distinction between Jew and Gentile, between white and black, to support any move which will give the aborigines their due rights in education and in citizenship, and to deprecate any suggestions which assert racial superiority.

—*The Church Standard, Australia.*

Geneva: Echoes of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity

In Great Britain a meeting took place in the Royal Empire Society's Hall in London, with the Dean of Windsor in the Chair, attended by representatives of the Anglican, Methodist and Roman Catholic Churches. All the speakers emphasized the fundamental elements which are essential for union: a spirit of repentance, an open mind and above all a spirit of prayer.

In Sweden, in Hastedagarden, in the diocese of Lund, about twenty priests came together for an ecumenical conference, lasting two days. Three Masses were celebrated—Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Lutheran.

In France during the Week of Prayer there were numerous activities especially among Roman Catholics. Mass was celebrated at Lyons by Cardinal Gerlier, the sermon being preached by Father Clémence. Msgr. Chevrot gave a lecture in which he showed that the only force which can break down the barriers dividing men is charity. He seized the opportunity of the Week of Prayer to allude to the plight of the Protestants in Spain and to protest against the acts of vandalism which had been perpetrated against them. "My brothers, who are separated today," he concluded, "even if we have not yet built any ladders high enough to scale the walls which divide us, we have at our disposal a force which is powerful enough to undermine them: our charity." At Metz, for the first time since the Reformation, Roman Catholics and Protestants met together under the sign of Christian unity. The crowd was so large in the meeting hall, that a second meeting had to be held in the evening. The Roman Catholic delegation was presided over by Msgr. Schmit surrounded by a large number of priests, professors and members of religious orders and congregations; while the President of the Reformed Consistory was also surrounded by his collaborators. The procession of choirs lasted two hours, singing together "the sweetest mystery of Christianity: Christmas."

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, Chairman

JOHN C. BENNETT LISTON POPE
F. ERNEST JOHNSON HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, Secretary

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH FRANCIS P. MILLER
UMPHREY LEE EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS

In Paris an ecumenical service was held on January 29, at the Anglican Church in the rue d'Aguesseau. It was attended by clergy from the Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed and Methodist (French and foreign) Churches. Bishop Chambers from the Church of England and Pastor Marc Boegner spoke on the prayer of Christ, "That they may be one, as we are one." The blessing was pronounced by Metropolitan Vladimir. The choir of Russian youth movements took part in this service. Another ecumenical meeting was organized by the Orthodox Institute of Saint-Denis at the Church of St. Irénée, attended by the Archimandrite van der Mensbrugge, and by Reformed, Lutheran and Anglican clergy. Many Roman Catholic priests also came and joined in these ecumenical prayers.

In Germany a Roman Catholic theologian, Karl

Adam, spoke in Stuttgart at the Evangelical Church of St. Mark. It must be 400 years since a Catholic theologian spoke in an Evangelical church to both Catholics and Protestants on the questions of faith which unite and—still—divide Christians. For three evenings over two thousand people listened with rapt attention to the captivating, passionate words of the learned speaker. (E.P.S., Geneva)

Yugoslavia: "The Church's Mission"

In a message sent on the occasion of the Eastern Orthodox Christmas (Jan. 7, 1948) and read in the churches of Yugoslavia, Patriarch Gavril, head of the Church, together with Metropolitan Josip of Skoplje, Metropolitan Damaskin of Zagreb, Bishop Jovan of Nish and Bishop Vikentije of Strumica, declared the intention of the Church to keep aloof from political matters, but to do all it can to promote the general spiritual and material welfare of the Yugoslav people.

"Christ's mission is not to solve the questions of this world, nor to decide whether Rome, Jerusalem or Babylon should rule," the message declared. "His task is not to assert the rights of one people at the expense of another, but rather to establish an empire of truth, righteousness and love among all people."

One of the characteristics of the Serbian Orthodox Church, the message goes on, "is that as a people's institution, it must spread love so widely that love of individuals for one another, for their families, friends and neighbors, will be unified into one greater love—love of their people and their fatherland.

"The fatherland is a unity of both physical and spiritual attributes held in love and esteem by the church. Our country is the mother of us all, and under her roof, all of us, her sons and daughters, should live and work in concord, brotherhood and unity for the sake of our general welfare and progress. In cooperation with all citizens of our state, we should each play his part in contributing to order, work, peace and blessedness." (E.P.S., Geneva)

Author in This Issue

Bayard Dodge is President of the American University of Beirut, Lebanon.

We have received notes from Prof. Emery Révész, Reformed Bishop, and from Lukács László, Director of the Library of the Reformed College, in Debrecen, Hungary. The Reformed College and Library are over 400 years old, but today lack foreign books and magazines. Director László, a graduate of the Episcopal Seminary in Philadelphia, writes that their Library was undamaged during the war, and that they would deeply appreciate receiving books and periodicals dealing with American Theology, Philosophy, and Pedagogy. We urge your consideration of this appeal, and suggest direct communication with: Lukács László, Director, Library of the Reformed College, Debrecen, Hungary.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-49